

REMARKS

Claims 39-73 (as renumbered as indicated below) remain pending in the application. Claims 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, 56, 57, 59, 60, 64 and 67 (as originally numbered) stand rejected for various reasons. The remaining claims are indicated to be allowable if certain claim objections and rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph are overcome.

Claim Renumbering

The applicant notes that that claim numbers is incorrect following claim 55. As such, the applicant has amended the claims beginning after the first claim numbered 55 to correct the claim numbering. Corresponding amendments to the dependencies are also made.

Claim Objections

The examiner raised several alleged informalities in the claims. The applicant believes the claims are clear as originally presented. Nontheless, the claims are amended as suggested by the examiner because the applicant believes that the proposed amendments in no way change the scope or meaning of the claim and amendment will advance prosecution of the application. The applicant requests the objections be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - § 112, Second Paragraph

The action rejects claims 50 and 67 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim that which the applicant regards as the invention. The applicant believes the claims are clear as presented, traverses the rejection and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

The action questions how in claim 50 and 68 (as renumbered) the second tapered portion can comprises each of the first portion and the second portion when the tapered portion claimed in the base claim 38 and 57 (as renumbered) comprises one of the first portion or the second portion. The claims are not inconsistent since the tapered portion may comprise either the first portion or the second portion while the second tapered portion also comprises the first portion and the second portion. One interpretation is simply that the

second tapered portion overlaps or is continuous with the first tapered portion to the extent that the second tapered portion comprises each of the first and second portions. Another interpretation may be that the second tapered portion is a part or portion of the claimed tapered portion. Still another interpretation is that the tapered portion does not comprise the entire first or second portion but instead only a portion thereof, the second tapered portion also then comprises a portion of or possibly all of the first and second portions. The foregoing possible interpretations are only examples and still other interpretations consistent with claimed structure may be found within the ordinarily understood meaning of the claims. As such, the applicant submits the claims are clear and distinct as presented and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejection - § 102(b)

The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 39, 40, 42, 43, 47, 50, 56, 58, 60, 61, 65 and 68 (as renumbered) and requests reconsideration.

As set forth in claims 39 and 57 (as renumbered) the recited transducer requires, among other things, a tapered portion with a nominal width defined by first and second side walls and a nominal rib gap defined by first and second upper walls. The rib gap is increased or decreased from nominal in a tapered portion.

In contrast, the Salvage patent teaches in Figs. 10-12 coil corners with an angled or chamfered construction decreasing a portion of the tunnel width and a portion of the rib gap. However, the nominal tunnel width and the nominal rib gap remain constant. Furthermore, as the rib gap in the claimed construction is defined by the first and second upper walls, the tapered portion will not also cause a reduction in the width, at least within the tapered portion, as happens with the structure taught in the Salvage patent.

Because Salvage does not teach or suggest a rib gap defined by first and second upper walls that is increased or decreased in a tapered section, Salvage cannot anticipate or render the claimed invention unpatentable.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: November 17, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony G Sitko/
Anthony G. Sitko
Registration No.: 36,278
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicant